

**From:** [ANDERSON Jim M](#)  
**To:** (b) (6); [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Portland Harbor - Prep for April 15 Technical Information Session  
**Date:** 04/07/2008 01:20 PM

---

David,  
Tomorrow, Tues 4/8 PM would work best for me. Thurs PM may be open, but I'd have to move somethings around.

Jim Anderson  
Manager, DEQ Portland Harbor Section  
ph: 503.229.6825  
fax: 503.229.6899  
cell: 971.563.1434

-----Original Message-----

From: dcbatson@imap.mail.rcn.net [mailto:dcbatson@imap.mail.rcn.net]  
Sent: Monday, April 07, 2008 11:39 AM  
To: blischke.eric@epamail.epa.gov; humphrey.chip@epamail.epa.gov;  
ANDERSON Jim M  
Subject: Portland Harbor - Prep for April 15 Technical Information Session

Eric,

Thanks for your availability & thoughts on the suggested questions.  
I am available anytime tomorrow afternoon until 5:00 PDT and on Thursday afternoon anytime until 4:00 PDT. It looks like that would make us both available from 11:00-5:00 PST tomorrow (Tuesday) & from 12:00-4:00 PDT on Thursday. My preference would be tomorrow, if possible.

ALL >> Would you be available for a call tomorrow (Tuesday) at 1:00 PDT?

If not, some other time between 11:00-5:00 PDT?

my conference line. Call-in # nonresponsi with access code nonrespon

Jim,

I have attached the list of suggested topics/questions for the technical session FYI. I sent it to Chip & Eric morning EDT but did not have your email address at the time.

Thanks,  
David

Original Message:

-----  
From: Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov  
Date: 10:40:15 -0700  
To: (b) (6); Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov  
Subj: arbor - April 15 Technical Information Session

David, tomorrow afternoon or Thursday afternoon would work best for me. I have a meeting that will probably go until 11:00 PDT tomorrow. I have a meeting that will probably go until noon PDT on Thursday. Wednesday is out. Friday I am tied up until 1:30 PDT.

I have reviewed the questions briefly. Here are some quick comments:

Question 1 - We have provided comments and are working through our issues on the Round 2 report to get everything resolved by June 1, 2008. This will allow the RI and risk assessment reports to be generated. We have a different schedule for the FS that is under development but our focus is on resolving FS issues raised by the Round 2 Report in a timely manner in order to allow the FS to begin as soon as we can. We can provide a brief summary on this point so people understand where we are.

Question 2 - RI data needs have been filled. Remaining data needs are related to the FS and will be filled this summer. We do not anticipate any additional data gaps although it is possible that some may crop up. As above, a brief summary or statement regarding data gaps should be sufficient.

Question 3 - We have provided comments on the development of iPRGs and iAOPCs. This is really the first FS issue that we need to resolve. We are meeting with the LWG this Wednesday to discuss our comments and further refine our path forward. Our comments are fairly specific about how we want this process to go forward. We could go through our vision during the meeting.

Question 4 - We have been performing this assessment. We have a model that will be used to identify erosional and depositional areas under a range of flow conditions and will estimate the depth of maximum and net scour under the same flow conditions. Upstream migration likely occurs under some conditions. This has not been quantified but is really based on an assessment of the nature and extent of contamination and what we know about release pathways. For the meeting, we can summarize the modeling effort and discuss some of the preliminary conclusions about river dynamics under various flow events.

Question 5 - Overwater activities is only one source of contamination that we are looking at. Quantification of releases associated with over-water activities is difficult. However, there is a clear link between historic overwater activities and the nature and distribution of sediment contamination. Key overwater activities that appear to have resulted in contamination include ship maintenance activities and materials loading and off-loading. I am not sure what to present or discuss at the meeting on this topic. I would prefer to present this material as part of a broader presentation on current and historic sources of contamination to the river.

Question 6 - This question is pretty wide open. Exposure pathways are species specific. The benthic community is likely to be impacted by a wider range of chemicals (metals, petroleum related chemicals) than birds and mammals (primarily PBTs such as dioxins, chlorinated pesticides and PCBs). For the meeting, we could talk about which exposure pathways and chemicals are considered key for which species and how they will be evaluated in the ecological risk assessment.

Question 7 - See Question 3 above. This should cover it.

Question 8 - This information has been tabulated by the LWG to the extent it is available. We have not really been looking at material that has already been removed and are focusing on data representative of existing conditions. Chemical results for material removed from the river via dredging will be eliminated from the risk assessment. The potential for future dredging activities will be considered in the future use scenarios associated with the baseline risk assessment and in the FS as a component of future site use.

Question 9 - We are still managing to 2010. We may not get there but that is our message.

Question 10 - We spent a lot of time last year resolving Round 3 data gaps. This information will be presented in the draft RI. Round 3 is essentially complete with the exception of a side-scan sonar surface for debris identification and some mobility testing. Both of these efforts will be completed this summer and are designed to support the FS. We may also perform some limited osprey egg sampling as part of a long-term monitoring program. No other data collection efforts are anticipated.

Regarding the last two items, we can provide contact information and a summary of the 104(e) request process.

Let me know if you have any questions and whether an early afternoon check-in on Tuesday or Thursday of this week would work for you.

Thanks, Eric

Non-  
Responsive

04/07/2008 07:48  
AM

To  
Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,  
Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA  
cc  
Subject  
Portland Harbor - April 15  
Technical Information Session

#### ADR CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION

NOTE: This is a confidential dispute resolution communication by a neutral assisting parties to resolve an issue in controversy and, as such, may not be disclosed by the recipient pursuant to the provisions of the ADR Act of 1996 and relevant state authorities. If you have received this communication by mistake, please return the original of this communication to the sender and destroy all copies. Do Not Release Under FOIA

Chip & Eric,

I wanted to find a time early this week to speak with you about the technical information session for the Portland Harbor site parties to be held on April 15. Jim Anderson says that he is able to help with the presentation as well, so I hope that he can join the call. I don't have his email, however, so I hope that you can forward this note to him for me. We discussed you making an overview presentation & answering questions from the participants. I have attached FYI the latest list of questions & topics that the parties would like you to address during the session. I assume that some will be addressed in your presentation & the rest we'll cover in a follow-up Q&A session.

Please let me know what time for a short call works best for you. Thanks again for helping the parties come up to speed regarding the site.

Thanks,  
David

P.S. - What AV equipment you would like in the room for your presentation?

(See attached file: Technical Meeting Topic Suggestions (4-4-08).doc)

-----  
mail2web - Check your email from the web at  
<http://link.mail2web.com/mail2web>